Notes

[1] Mélanges K. Michałowski, Varsovie 1966.

[2] K. Michałowski, Od Efdu do Faras, Warszawa 1974 (in Polish); id., The Polish School of Mediterranean Archaeology, "Quarterly Journal of the History of Science and Technology", 25 (1980), pp. 707-720.

[3] R. Boulton, Wieczność piramid i tragedia Pompei, Warszawa 1927 and subsequent editions.

Zdzisław J. Kapera

FOLIA ORIENTALIA, XXIV, 1987

Thomas V. Gamkrelidze and Vjacheslav [sic] V. Ivanov, Indoevropejskij jazyk i indoevropejcy. Rekonstrukcija i istoriko-tipologičeskij analiz prajazyka i protokul'tury, Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo Universiteta, Tbilisi, 1984, I-II, XCVI + 1328 p.

This enormous book by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov is a major work and will certainly have many reviews. For this reason as well as for lack of space, the scope of the present review is very limited: not intending to give an overall judgment on the book, I only would like to draw attention to some points which seem to me dubious.

According to G. and I. (p. 1325), the original homeland of the Indo-Europeans was in the region of Lake Urmia. I cannot agree with this opinion because, to my mind, the original homeland of Indo-Europeans is identical with that of Balts and Slavs, i. e. the basin of the Oder, Vistula and Neman rivers, the vocabulary of Baltic and Slavic being more archaic than that of any other IE language (see Le problème de l'habitat primitif des Indo-Européens, "FoLH 5, 1984, p. 199-210 [1]). It is easy to adduce an argument against the opinion of G. and I. Let us only consider the relationship between Armenian, Greek and Latin. G. and I. claim that the ancestors of the Greeks came from the region of Lake Urmia to Greece through Asia Minor, whereas the ancestors of the Romans came from Armenia to Italy following a route via Khorezm, South Russia and Central Europe. It is obvious that a connection exists between linguistic kinship and the distribution of languages on the earth, e. g. Portuguese resembles Spanish more than Catalan, Spanish is more closely related to Catalan than to Provençal, Catalan resembles Provençal more than French, etc. Thus, if the migrations of the ancestors of the Greeks and Romans, postulated by G. and I., had really taken place, there should be more similarities between Latin and Armenian than between Latin and Greek, but this is not the case. I compared a fragment of the Gospel (Luke, XXIV) in these three languages and found the following lexical similarities (concerning the consonantal skeleton of the root) between Latin and Armenian (numbers in-

dicate the frequency of occurrence): ajo, asem, εἶπον 1; ex, i, από 1; hic, ast, ἐνθάδε 1, ὧδε 1; hic, ays, οὗτος 5; in, i, ἐπί 3; mors, mah, θάνατος 1; mortuus, meṙeal, νεκρός 2; qualiter, orpēs, ὡς 1; qui, or, ὅς 8; quo, or, οὗ 1; sic, ayspēs, οὕτως 1; suus, iwr, αὐτοῦ 2; venio, eki, ἦλθον 2.

The similarities between Latin and Greek were as follows: ab, ἀπό, i 5; advesperascit, ἑσπέρα, erek 1; cognosco, γιγνώσκω, gitem 1; declino, κλίνω, xonarhecʿucʿanem 1; fero, ἀναφέρω, veranam 1; in, ἐν, z 2; inclino, κλίνω, taražamem 1; iste, οὗτος, ayn 1, -n 1; maneo, μένω, aganim 1; monumentum, μνῆμα, gerezman 1; monumentum, μνημεῖον, gerezman 4; nos, ἡμεῖς, mekʿ 5; noster, ἡμῶν, mer 4; quia, ὅτι, tʿē 2; quod, ὅτι, tʿē 1; quoniam, ὅτι, tʿē 2; sto, ἐφίστημι, hasanem 1; sto, ἵστημι, kenam 1; trado, παραδίδωμι, matnem 1; tunc, τότε, yaynžam 1; vester, ὑμῶν, jer 1; vestis, ἑσθής, handerj 1; video, ἰδεῖν, tesanem 2; vos, ὑμεῖς, dukʿ 2, jez 5 [2].

On the whole, there are 30 lexical similarities between Latin and Armenian and 50 between Latin and Greek. Two conclusions follow from these statistical data: the fact that there are more similarities between Latin and Greek than between Latin and Armenian (a) is understandable if one admits that the original homeland of the Indo-Europeans was in a territory situated south of the Baltic Sea, and (b) is not compatible with the hypothesis according to which the starting point of prehistorical IE migrations was somewhere in Armenia. It has to be added that the names of plants and animals not found in the basin of the Oder, Vistula and Neman rivers cannot be of IE origin.

As far as the "glottalic theory" is concerned, I do not agree with it either. The following arguments can be mentioned:

(1) It is deplorable that G. and I. show too little criticism in relationship to different theories à la mode. Among others, Jakobson's claim that "no language adds to the pair /t̰/ - /d/ a voiced aspirate /d̰ʰ/ without having its voiceless counterpart /t̰ʰ/" is false, because an Austronesian language, called Kelabit, shows series of stops of the type t̰, d, d̰ʰ (see R. A. Blust, A Double Counter-Universal in Kelabit, "Working Papers in Linguistics, Department of Linguistics, University of Hawaii" vol. 5, 1973, p. 49-55).

(2) It is scarcely probable that Armenian, Anatolian and Germanic, which surely developed on foreign substrata, preserved a more archaic consonantism than Baltic and Slavic, where the percentage of words of obscure origin is so insignificant that it can be ascribed to the imperfection of our etymological knowledge.

(3) The traditional view according to which Germanic underwent a Lautverschiebung in the prehistorical period is strengthened by the fact that similar phenomena occurred in the historical period in German and in Danish.

For many years, I have drawn attention to the fact that, in all languages, the development of the form of words depends not only on regular sound change and analogical evolution, but also on irregular sound change due to frequency, which occurs more or less in one third of the words in texts (see Le caractère archaïque du type v. ind. bhárāmi, [in:] Studia Indo-Iranica, Wrocław, 1983, p. 79-83). This applies also to comparative

grammar. E. g. G. and I.'s claim that numerals of the type Lat. viginti are more archaic than those of the type OCS dъva deseti (p. 847) is improbable in the light of the theory of irregular sound change due to frequency.

According to G. and I., the apophony e/o is of "morphonological" origin (p. 177). Since analogical development mostly consists of not introducing but eliminating alternations, I would prefer looking for a phonetic cause of this phenomenon (see L'apophonie e/o en grec, [in:] Festschrift Szemerényi, Amsterdam, 1979, p. 529-535).

The fact that in IE languages the medial forms are more differentiated than the active ones does not necessarily mean that the latter arose earlier than the former (p. 332). This may be due to the fact that the medial voice, which is less frequently used, undergoes analogical changes more easily than the active voice (see Tendances générales du développment morphologique, "Lingua" 12, 1963, p. 19-38).

The original meaning of words like Lat. pecu (p. 469) was not 'cattle' (see Scs. skotъ , goc. skatts a łac. pecū, pecūnia, RSI, 36, 1975, p. 67--71).

The arbitrary character of language was not discovered by Saussure (p. LXXIII), but was already known to Greek philosophers 2300 years ago (see Critique du structuralisme, "FoL" 3, 1969, p. 169-177).

Phonetic changes of euphemistic origin are not a proof that regular sound change is not exceptionless (p. 459).

As far as the notion of "markedness" is concerned, I went further than G. and I. (p. LXXXVI), because I formulated a law applying to a connection between the differentiation of linguistic elements and their frequency (see Sur la théorie de catégories 'marquées' et 'non marquées' de Greenberg, "Linquistics" 59, 1970, p. 29-36).

In general, one has to state that many mistakes could be avoided if linguists were willing to reflect upon the fundamental problem of criteria of truth in linguistics (see Critères de vérité dans la linguistique, "GL" 20, 1980, p. 140-145).

While reading these critical remarks, one should however not forget that the enormous work by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, which testifies to their admirable erudition, consists of more than 1400 pages.

Notes

[1] Abbreviations according to Linguistic Bibliography.

[2] I am indebted to my friend Andrzej Pisowicz for his aid in establishing these lists.

Witold Mańczak

Note: In the following series of articles, the American linguist Allan R. Bomhard has discussed and successfully refuted all of the objections, criticisms, doubts, concerns, etc. raised against the Glottalic Model of Proto-Indo-European consonantism:

2016 "The Glottalic Model of Proto-Indo-European Consonantism: Re-igniting the Dialog". *Slovo a Slovesnost* 77:371—391.

2019a "The Importance of Hittite and the Other Anatolian Daughter Languages for the Reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European Phonological System". *Wékʷos* 5:73—95.

2019b "The Importance of Armenian for Understanding the Development of the Proto-Indo-European Phonological System in Old Indic, Greek, and Italic". Published on-line under a Creative Commons License. (Revised 27 January 2023.)

All of these articles are available for free download from academia.edu.